

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?		The emission reduction target we are to direct our efforts toward. It also would have been much more productive to have a list of suggested or likely control strategies we should consider locally. No one I have spoken to feels they have the technical expertise to navigate the universe of options.	It is difficult to make some of these determinations without knowing costs and potential benefits.			I don't think any as it seemed quite complete and detailed. However,since this was my first exposure there may have been something that I wouldn't even know about.		We should have been provided with an executive summary or an abbreviated document that we could use to help bring people up to speed on what the issue, the complexity of the issue, and the expectations of the State/EPA and this process.
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.		From the inventory it seems clear mobile source emissions and area source solvents are no brainier starting points for any control strategy discussion. It would be nice to have more detail on the control options for those categories.	Run a list of possible control strategies through the model to give us an idea of potential reductions before making assignments to come up with a "top 5".					I asked Stacey for additional information relative to the above question. All I received was the last half of the power point presentation and no summary as promised.
Have you already developed your constituent group?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No			Yes
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?		10	9	10				10
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?		1	2	1				1
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	4	1				3
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		3	2	2				4
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		3	3	1				4
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)				Informed by personal or professional interest

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by media				Informed by media
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?			Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest				Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?			Other	Informed using DAQ website or publications				Other
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?				Other				Informed using DAQ website or publications
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?		In concept a good approach. However it is not very productive at this stage. The information is too broad to appropriately react to. Too many unknowns. The information we have is far to limited to have meaningful conversations about options.	The information is to technical for constituents in most groups.					A few of the constituents have attended previous meetings/workshops on PM2.5.
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?		Mobile	Mobile	Mobile				Mobile
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?		Area	Area	Area				Area
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?			Point	Point				Point
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.		Yes	No	Yes				Yes
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.		Some interaction was via email.	Local health department employees understand the difference					Used a DAQ hand-out to help clarify the distinctions.
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.		30 - 60 min	60+ min					30 - 60 min
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.		30 - 60 min	60+ min					30 - 60 min
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.			0 - 30 min					30 - 60 min

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.		Yes	Yes	No				Yes
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.		Limited awareness	I/M Programs, Wood burning programs, point source controls					Vehicle Emmissions - testing, diesel retrofit, ride sharing, trip reduction.
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications	EPA list provided to workgroups				Other
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest	Independent research				Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed by personal or professional interest				Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?		Other	Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications				EPA list provided to workgroups
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?				Other				Independent research
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?		On-road vehicle inspection and Maintenance Program. (these were not ranked. All these recommendations are provided so they may be evaluated and the overall emission reduction benefit calculated by DEQ and information be brought back to local stake holder so we can may better informed choices.	I/M Program for gasoline and diesel vehicles. OBD 1996 & newer, TSI 1995 & older.	clean fuel incentive/alternative fuel				We didn't necessarily rank them as No. 1 - No. 5. The first was a Vehicle Emissions Testing Progam. Most folks agreed with this as a concept, but the details need to be worked out - who pays, do we target older cars, do we use a simplified system for newer cars, etc.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	3	5				3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	5				4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		2	2	5				4

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	3	5				3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	3	2				4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	3	2				3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		3	5	4				3
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Some sort of area solvent control and management program (the groups concluded we need more information on options for this).	Solvent control on small point sources: Graphic arts, painting, degreasing, printing, etc.	Commercial diesel retrofit.				Combined two components into one - (1)Diesel Retrofit - looking at the City's fleet of both on road diesel and off road diesel & upgrade of all gasoline vehicles.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		2	2	3				2
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	5				4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	2	3				3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	2	3				3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	5	1				4

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	5	3				4
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	5	3				4
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Voluntary Employer based trip reduction program (CVTD, van pools etc). This program would need to be responsive to inversion high PM 2.5 episodes.	Commercial cooking and wood burning controls for organic carbon: Charbroiling, frying, wood stoves	Federal reformulated gasoline.				Idling Engine Program - reduce/eliminate unnecessary idling of vehicles - mainly police fleet who idle vehicles to keep computers/electronics powered. Look at limiting idling engines and installing a secondary battery system to power electronic components.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	2				3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	5				4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	3	4				4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	3	2				2
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		4	3	3				4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		4	4	3				3

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	4					3
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Idling vehicle ordinance	Adopt California standards for the sale of small engines such as snow blowers and snowmobiles, and ban the sale of 2 cycle engines	Replacement				Employee Trip Reduction Program - using a combination of financial incentives, ride sharing, van pools, etc.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	3				2
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	5	5				2
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	5	3				3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		2	5	2				3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		2	1	3				3
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		4	1	3				4
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		3	4					3
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Improved Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian infrastructure and service.	VMT Reduction program including a 6 month registration option, increased bus service, coordinating with business to reduce employee VMTs on yellow and red air days, carpooling campaign, etc.	Cap/capture ammonia @ manure pits				Trip Reduction Program - during workhours - limit amount of driving of non-essential employees during yellow/red days by directing work efforts into non-vehicular types of efforts (safety training, etc.).

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		2	5	2				2
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	5	5				2
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		2	4	3				3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	5	1				3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		2	2	3				3
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		2	1	4				3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	4	4				3
What time of day is best to meet?		Either	Morning	Either				Either
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.		No	Yes	Yes				Yes
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.		I think we need more time. If DEQ comes with detailed information about the options (and unanswered questions) for each of the top control strategies, it will take time to sort through. Perhaps their could be offline involvement with groups of stakeholders that are interested in more detail and involvement.						

Survey Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?		Yes	No	No				No
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?		Staff at the DEQ have a great deal of expertise with regard to determining the relative value of varies control strategies and their difficulty in implementation. To date the group has not benefited from this expertise because of political sensitivities on the part of DEQ (of not wanting to be perceived as forcing anything on us locally). This is not in our best interest locally. We need to jump into the "meat" of the discussion at the next meeting and have some good technical advise and recommendations from DEQ. We need to be focused on the few options that provides the most cost effective way to get us to our emission reduction target. Too many details are yet to be worked out and we do not have time to dance around with political sensitivities.						

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	I would appreciate if DEQ would have narrowed the control strategies down to the top ten. It is a daunting task to recommend control strategies when this is not your background or expertise. I felt like this would save time and wasted energy.	Perhaps a list of potentail/recommended remediation approaches; maybe more concrete options on reduction scenarios, essentially a list of what has been attempted in the past	More information on the conditions and factors that cause the particulate formation resulting in non-attainment, and how we can reasonably address these factors. More information on how VOCs interplay with the NOx.	More time and information on completing the Emission Mangement Strategy Worksheet	It was noted that in Cache Valley there was only 1 point source permitted at over 100 tons/yr (I think that was the number). A breakout of smaller classes of sources would have been/will be helpful
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	I would appreciate members of the DEQ to recommend the top 10 control strategies and then educate us on the potential benefits of each so that we are more educated on control strategies and it limits the list we have to select from.	see above	Do we see any change in health costs related to PM10 and PM2.5?		
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?				7	
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	1		3	1	
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		3	4	
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2		3	3	
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4		3	4	
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by media		Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest	

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed using DAQ website or publications	
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Other	Informed by media	
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Other		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other	
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?					
			Works pretty well.	No	
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile		Mobile	Mobile	Area
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area		Point	Point	Mobile
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point		Area	Area	Point
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.					
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	30 - 60 min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	No		Yes	Yes	
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.			Reduce emissions from cars. Recognize the importance of VOCs and NH3.	The County Council has discuss Air Quality many times over the last ten years and have discussed the possible need for Vehicle Emission Testing during that process	
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications	EPA list provided to workgroups
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Other	EPA list provided to workgroups	Other
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed using DAQ website or publications	Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			EPA list provided to workgroups	Other	Independent research
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Vehicle inspection & maintenance program		Reduce emissions from diesel and gas engines during critical periods.	Emmission Testing for Older Vehicles. Pre 1996 and a method to prevent vehicles that did not pass from driving on Red Air Days.	Federal reformulated gasoline
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5	2	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5	3	5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		5	3	5

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4	3	4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			5	4	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		4	3	2
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		5	5	
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Solvent Control & Management		Containment of silage gases thereby reducing VOCs.	Major reduction in Vehicle Miles Travel (VMT) during Red Air Days	High enhanced I/M Program for NOx or VOCs
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4	2	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		4	5	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		5	4	3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		3	2	3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		2	5	4

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		3	4	3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		4	4	
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Voluntary Trip Reduction		Reduce ammonia emissions from manure application to fields by incorporating in a timely manner.	Point Source Controls	VOC emission reductions from area sources, specifically graphic arts, surface coating, and commercial/consumer categories
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5	3	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5	4	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5	2	4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5	3	3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2		3	2	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2		3	3	4

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		4	2	
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Vehicle Idle reduction Ordiance		Reduce ammonia emissions by separating manure from urine.	Area Source Controls	Diesel retrofit - NOx absorber
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		1	3	4
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		2	4	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		1	3	4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		1	4	4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2		2	3	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2		5	3	3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		1	3	
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements		Reduce ammonia emissions by lowering crude protein in animal diets.	We didn't get to a 5 strategy.	

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			1		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			2		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			1		
What time of day is best to meet?	Either	Afternoon	Either	Either	Either
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.			Whatever it takes.		

Survey Question	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	Yes	No	Yes	No	
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	I hope to see at the next meeting information on the effectiveness of different control strategies in other areas or through modeling.		Issue of relative value of VOCs vs ammonia and NOx in the formation of PM2.5 needs much greater clarification. Better communication on completing the survey - we knew we needed to do this, but the information to access the survey was missing.		